UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/804,621 03/12/2001		Serge Willenegger	PA363DIVC1	3167	
23696 7590 02/14/2008 OUALCOMM INCORPORATED			EXAMINER		
5775 MOREHO	OUSE DR.		WILSON, F	WILSON, ROBERT W	
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2619		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
• .			02/14/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com kascanla@qualcomm.com nanm@qualcomm.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	0'
09/804,621	WILLENEGGER ET A	L.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Robert W. Wilson	2619	

	Robert VV. VVIISON	2019						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	sory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th in SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)		KOT KEPET WAS FILE	S WITTING TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on open filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension at CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened starbove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(and the corresponding amount of the fee. tutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any explore a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	tension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f will not be entered l	hecause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co			occause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		_						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	••	educing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	omnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		omphant Amendment	(1 102 024).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		timely filed amendm	ent canceling					
the non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-		ill be entered and an	explanation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected to:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	it before or on the date of filing a N	Notice of Appeal will <u>n</u>	ot be entered					
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary					
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).								
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	, , , ,	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13.		pobert W.	Wilson					
		Robert W Wilson Examiner	2/11/08					

Art Unit: 2619

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument that the combination of referenced need to demonstrate "adjusting one of several subchannel singal from a single remote station" because applicant has not claimed this limitation. The examiner respectfully disagrees that Walton needs to demonstrate "single remote station that individually controls the power level of at least one of them" because this is not a claimed limitation. The examiner respectfully disagrees that Walton does not teach: a plurality of thresholds. Walton teaches a plurality of thresholds per col. 6 lines 45 to 67 and col. 3 line 16 to col. 4 line 45. Walton does not expressly call for: Frame Error Rate per col. 18 lines 28 to 49. It would have been obvious to substitute the frame error rate of Raith in place of measuring the singal power of Walton because both FER and signal power are quality measurments which can be utilized to determine the deterioration of a channel.